

REMARKS

The following remarks are submitted to be fully responsive to the final Official Action dated June 22, 2006. This response is thus timely submitted within the three-month shortened statutory period for response. Should additional fees be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Kagan Binder Deposit Account No. 50-1775 and thereafter notify us of the same. Reconsideration of all outstanding grounds of the rejection and allowance of the subject application are believed in order and respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, withdrawn claims 41-48 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein as being directed to a non-elected invention. Dependent claims 30, 31 and 39 have also been canceled as the subject matter therein has been incorporated within independent claim 27.

In the final Office Action, the drawings are objected to as allegedly not showing features of the presently claimed invention. Furthermore claims 27-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to describe certain claimed subject matter similar to that objected to in the drawings. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings and rejection of the claims is requested as it is submitted that each claimed feature is clearly illustrated and described in the subject specification in support of the claims.

Initially, it is submitted that Applicant's previous response filed April 11, 2006 clearly and completely pointed out the relevant support as illustrated and described with respect to each claimed feature of the present invention. As such, Applicant's arguments presented in the response of April 11, 2006 are incorporated herein and reiterated. Moreover, as relevant to claim 27 as presently amended, the subject application, including both the drawings and specification, describes trays with repositories 156 on one side of a tray for receiving and retaining suspensions (the claimed component receptacles) that include base plate seats 162 and load beam seats 165. The specification clearly describes such features to a tray construction on pages 33 and 34 including the explicit statement that adjacent stacked trays cooperate to retain the suspensions in place in the repository 156, such as during shipping (see page 33, lines 4-8). Furthermore, the second side (bottom side) of the same tray is described on pages 35 and 36 as including component repositories 194 for receiving suspensions having base plate seats 200 and load beam seats 204. On page 36 at lines 5-10, it is stated that "the individual component receptacles within the repository 156 will align with those of repository 194 when the trays are stacked," and that "when the tray 102 is stacked onto another tray 102, the repositories 156 and 194 will be facing

each other and a component receptacle in one repository will be aligned with the component receptacle in the other.” Each of the above discussed features that are claimed are also clearly illustrated in Figs. 6 and 8 individually and in Fig. 9 showing a stack of trays (one solid lined and the others in dashed lines) from the side with the features illustrated on both sides of each tray. Figs. 10 and 11 further illustrate enlarged portions of these trays with the features shown as engaged with suspension drawn in dashed lines. It is submitted that what is shown in Figs. 9, 10 and 11 is completely commensurate with that claimed in claim 27, which is a plurality of trays with component receiving and seating features claimed in a stack for the purpose of receiving and retaining suspensions by cooperating alignment of features when in a stack. Moreover, the above noted descriptions in the specification provide a complete and clear description of the claimed invention that one of ordinary skill in the art would completely understand. Additionally, Figs. 18A and 18B are noted for showing specific aspects of the capture of a suspension “E” between adjacent trays 102A, 102B and 102C.

Based upon the above, it is submitted that the objection to the drawings and rejection of the claims under 112, first paragraph, is entirely unfounded and should be withdrawn. The drawings do indeed show each and every claimed feature (there is no basis that drawing aspects such as the claimed stack of trays cannot be shown with dashed lines) including a drawing with a stack of trays (Fig. 9) for receiving head suspensions and drawings including the suspensions as positioned between specific tray features (Figs. 18A and 18B). Also, the specification clearly and completely describes each of the claimed features and describes explicitly how to stack and align trays for receiving and retaining suspensions therein. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings and rejection of the claims under 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

As to the prior art rejection of record, claims 27 and 28 have been rejected (for the first time in the final action) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by the Royer et al reference. By this response, the limitations of claims 30 and 31 have been incorporated within claim 27. Whereas claims 30 and 31 have not been rejected under the Royer et al reference, it is submitted that independent claim 27 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 27-40 are currently in condition for allowance, a notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner finds any issue remaining after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, at the Examiner's convenience, in order to expedite any remaining prosecution.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9-22-06

By:



Mark W. Binder, Reg. No. 32,642
Customer Number 33072
Phone: 651-275-9805
Facsimile: (651) 351-2954